

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/760,141	<b>Applicant(s)</b> FARNWORTH, BRIAN	
	<b>Examiner</b> ANISH DESAI	<b>Art Unit</b> 1794	

**All Participants:**

(1) ANISH DESAI.

(2) Dianne Burkhard (Attorney).

**Status of Application:** RCE

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 17 March 2010

**Time:** approx 11.30A

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None*

Claims discussed:

*27, 30, 44-47*

Prior art documents discussed:

*None*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Callie E. Shosho/  
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794  
 /Anish Desai/  
 Examiner, Art Unit 1794

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On 03/16/10, in response to the Examiner's query that claim 27 as presently amended appears to be substantial duplicate of claim 30, Ms. Burkhard provided reasons as to why claim 27 is not a substantial duplicate of claim 30. Upon further consideration of claim 27 in view of Mr. Burkhard's arguments, on 03/17/10 the Examiner agreed. Additionally, the Examiner stated that following amendments are necessary before the application can be allowed: (1) deletion of "The present invention is directed to" in abstract, (2) update the continuity data on page 1 of the specification to indicate that CIP application SN 10/207,626 is now abandoned, and (3) in each of claims 44-47, replace "a flat insulation structure" with "the flat insulation structure". Ms. Burkhard gave the Examiner authorization to amend the application.